Revenue (1926) Department.

Ordinary SERIES

G.O. No. 727

727

DATED 1-5-1926

[Despatch Abstract.]

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara - Mangalore Taluk - Orders passed.

Copy of Memorandum to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement, No.962 E/25-1, dated the 22nd April 1925:--

Survey - South Kanara District - Kasaragod taluk - Kumeri villages- Reference from the Board of Revenue, No.C.3574/24-2, dated 26-2-1925.

The attention of the Board of Revenue is invited to Mr. Priestleys remarks on the subject. It would seem that the proposed survey of the kumeri villages would be justifiable only if the cost of such survey will be low as there is no evidence that any large area is coming under regular cultivation. The Board of Revenue is accordingly requested to furnish Government with an approximate estimate of the cost of the survey.

2. In this connection the Government observe that the resurvey of the Kasaragod taluk was justified on account of the special badness of the survey while there does not seem to be any special reasons for the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk.

3. Accordingly while the work sanctioned and now to be sanctioned in Kasaragod taluk should be pushed on the Government are not satisfied that there are any good grounds for the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk and no further work for the purpose of resurvey there should be done till further orders.

4. The Board is requested to submit to Government a report showing what exactly has been done to date and what the standards are on which the Director of Survey based his report R.O.C.570 R/F, of 1923 dated 4-4-24 disposed of in G.C.No.1239 dated 11-8-24.

5. The Board is also requested to report whether the Collector of South Kanara was consulted when the original report was submitted to Government as to whether difficulties had been experienced in the revenue administration because of any inaccuracy or incompleteness of the survey record. If the Collector was not consulted then it should be done now. If the Collector was consulted details should be furnished.

6. The Board of Revenue is requested to treat the

matter as urgent and to see that no delay is allowed to occur in the submission of reply.

3

C.F. 31—10 138—8-9-24.

REVENUE **DEPARTMENT.**

CURRENT No. Rev 2065-E
1065-

Received ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT. 10 JUN 1925 REVENUE DEPARTMENT 192 *Registered* 192

Subject.

Survey- Resurvey (Malabar)- Mangalore taluk- Investigation

ENCLOSURES.
No.
Spare copies

Refce. No. G. 3574/24-3

Station Madras. , *Dated the* 9th June 1925. 192

From

The Board of Revenue, ~~Revenue Settlement~~ Land Revenue and ~~Separate Revenue~~ etc.

To

M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur T. Raghaviah Pantulu Garu, C.S.I
Commissioner of Land Revenue & Settlement.

~~Resolution~~ Reference.

1. Read the following papers:-

Memorandum from Government, Revenue Department, No.962 R/25-1 dated 22nd April 1925.

Board's Refce. No.G. 3574/24-3 dated 24th April 1925.

Letter from F.P.Vincent Gompertz Esq./ Director of Survey, R.O.C.No.268 R/F of 25 dated the 13th May 1925.

Letter from G. W. Wells Esq., M.A.,I.C.S.,Collector of South Kanara, D.Dis. No3538-25 dated the 24th May 1925.

Reference.

With reference to paragraphs 4 and 5 of Government Memorandum No.962 R/25-1 dated 22nd April 1925, the Board submits the following report:

2. The Board has ascertained that no further work has been done in the Mangalore taluk after the issue of G.O. 1239 Mis., dated 11-8-24. The aggregate area of the two villages Bodantila and Tiruvail resurveyed experimentally in the Mangalore taluk is 3216.50 acres. The Director based his report R.O.C. No.570 R/F of 1923 dated 4-4-24 on the following data.

Holdings which required resurvey.

Village.	Holdings according to current adangal.	Holdings measured during experimental survey.	Holdings whose boundaries were correct but whose area was incorrect by more than 10%	Holdings whose boundaries were incorrect	Holdings composed of parts of present registered holdings.	Total.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bodantila	931	1134	40 ∎	356	492	888
Tiruvail	1190	310	47 *	199	372	618

∎ Excludes 16 holdings whose areas differ by 5 per cent and more but less than 10 per cent.
* Excludes 11 holdings -do- -do-

He states that in Tiruvail a number of adangal subdivisions had been clubbed and that the figure 618 contained many of these, so that the actual number of adangal subdivisions requiring resurvey was greater than 618. He also presumes that the areas of many of the subdivisions shown in columns 5 and 6 are incorrect but reports that it was not possible to test these as the old boundaries could not be reproduced.

3. The Director of Survey also enumerates the following defects in the existing survey.

"The initial survey of the Mangalore taluk was not on a traverse basis. The number of theodolite stations is 3.4 per sq. mile in the district, omitting Kasaragod, and the marjority of them fixed by triangulation cannot be replaced."

"The

"The villages were measured in blocks of about 160 acres. These were divided into long triangles the sides of which were chained and offsets taken to field trijunctions and bends and sometimes to bends on subdivision boundaries. The perimeters of fields and subdivision boundaries were also measured.

"The stones at the corners of the long triangles cannot be replaced correctly when missing and the country has been so thickly planted since the survey that the offsets from the long triangle lines can seldom be remeasured when these stones are existing. To make matters worse, the preparation of the existing ferroprint record of measurements which were traced from the block maps, were not undertaken until about 15 years after the survey when the measurements which were written on the block maps in light blue ink had faded and were often illegible, so that the printed record contains many incorrect measurements and many have been omitted."

4. In view of the above defects the Director of Survey considers that missing stones cannot be replaced correctly and that a shanbogue cannot measure and plot a new subdivision unless he remeasures the whole field thereby stultifying the record of measurement for the fields adjoining.

5. The Collector of South Kanara who has now been consulted states that the following difficulties have been experienced in the revenue administration of the Mangalore taluk.

'(1) Missing survey marks could not be replaced correctly in a number of cases, firstly because it was difficult to relay the original offsets from the sides of long triangles into which the blocks have been divided, secondly because many measurements have been omitted from the ferro prints and a large number of measurements contained in them are wrong, and lastly because most of the fields have not been supplied with independent plottable data.

(2) 'The measurement and plotting of a new subdivision more often than not, necessitated the resurvey of the whole field and of the fields adjoining it. This resurvey work

was laborious, because the atlas of field measurement books contains mostly perimeter measurements without affording sufficient data for independent plotting. Hence a number of darkhast and patta transfer cases were delayed until this work was completed and the errata approved.'

(3) 'To rectify the survey errors noticed by the ordinary Revenue staff from time to time, errata have been issued in almost all the villages of the taluk since settlement and 422 entire fields have been remeasured.'

6. Both the Director of Survey and the Collector (Mr. Wells) consider that a resurvey is an administrative necessity and the Board agrees with them.

7. The Director of Survey is requested to expedite report regarding the estimate of the cost of survey of the Kumeri villages called for in paragraph 1 of the Government Memorandum.

To the Second Secretary to Government.
,, Director of Survey (para 7 only)

K S Venkataraman
Asst. Secretary.

J.C./9.6.

Extract of para 3 of the Ref from the Board of Rev Mis No. 1562 dt 20-7-25 9L

The Board await the orders of Govt on its reference No. G 3574/24-4 dt 9-6-25 regarding the reservacy of the Mangalore Taluk.

Survey - Resurvey - Mangalore taluk - Para 3 of the Proceedings of the Board of Rev No 1562 of 20.7-25

O.M. No. 3184 E-25-1 d 28-9-25

According to its reference No. G. 3574/24-4 of 9-6-25, the Board of Rev is informed that the Govt consider field maps of the villages of the Mangalore taluk may be quite accurate enough and enable subdivisions to be made and stones to be replaced notwithstanding that the survey was not on the traverse basis and that the villages were measured in 160 acre blocks and were divided into long triangles. If these considerations were sufficient it would simply mean that all areas surveyed on the block maps. System or 'G' line System should be redone the thickly planting of the

H M's no 6-7 N.F.

E r Rem. 30.11.25

Country will affect the replacement of stones under any System of Survey as there is no System that will enable this to be done without measuring ~~necessary~~ offsets. The Board of Rev is accordingly requested to report on the quality of the Survey work in the Mangalore taluk and the possibility of using it as a basis for future work irrespective of the fact that the Survey is not on the traverse basis

As regards
~~With reference to~~ para 3 of the Board's Proceedings No. 1562 misc dy 20-7-25, the Board of Rev is informed that as the result of the Conference and in view of the orders issued in O.M. No. 1804 E/25-3 dy 10-7-25 the Board would be reporting further on the point and that was the reason why no orders were passed on the Board's R. No. G. 3574/24-4 dy 9-6-25 ~~regard~~ relating to the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk.

RD
26/9/25

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.** C.F. 31

CURRENT No. Rev. 4034. E

Received 5-DEC 1925 192 . Registered 5 12 1925

Subject.

Survey- Resurvey (South Kanara)- Mangalore taluk- Further investigation.

ENCLOSURES.
No.
Spare copies.

Refce. No. G 3676/25-2

Station Madras *Dated the* 5th December '25 192

From

The Board of Revenue Land Revenue and Revenue Settlement, etc. Separate--Revenue.

Resolution Reference. N.Macmichael Esq.,I.C.S., Commr. of Land Revenue and Sett.-

Read the following papers:-

I

Memorandum from Government, Revenue Department, No.3184 E-25-1, dated the 28th September 1925.

II

Board's Reference thereon No. G 3676/25-1, dated the 5th October 1925.

III

Letter from F.P.Vincent Gompertz Esq., Director of Survey, Madras, D.Dis.No. 642/R/F of 25 dated the 10th November '25:-

Survey- Mangalore taluk- Quality of work-Report submitted.

Please see Board's Reference No.G 3676/25-1, dated the 5th October 1925.

2 The field maps of the Mangalore taluk were traced from the block maps and most of them contain perimeter measurements only

They are not accurate enough to enable stones to b replanted without the assistance of the offset measurements in the block maps. The measurements in these were written in pale blue ink, so that they should not appear when the block maps were reduced by photography to form the village maps, and many of them had become undecipherable when it was considered necessary some ten years after the survey to provide Shanbogues with a complete record of measurement- the ferro prints.

Many measurements have therefore been omitted in the ferro prints and many of the measurements entered are incorrect.

3. Thickly planting of the country would not affect replacement of stones in areas surveyed on the diagonal and offset method and on a traverse basis, as each field plan provides short offsets for the replacement of any stone or point in the field and checks on the correctness of the perimeter measurements The offsets in block map surveys branch from lines sometimes more than 40 chains long, the initial and closing points often cannot be identified and it is generally beyond the competence of the Shabogues to lay out the lines even when the points can be identified.

The unreliability of the present records of measurement makes the task far more difficult.

4. Nor are the field maps sufficient to enable sub-divisions to be made.

The Collector of South Kanara reported- para 5 of Board's Ref.No.G 3574-24-4 dated 9th June 25-that 'the measurement and plotting of a new sub division, more often than

not necessitated the resurvey of the whole field and of the fields adjoining it'.

This has been my experience elsewhere. Had the survey been on a traverse basis, there would have been some fixed points to start from and close on to.

5. I am dealing here with Mangalore taluk only and it is possible that the survey in other taluks will not be so - defective. It was found during the experimental survey that 80 per cent of the holdings in Bodanthila and 77 per cent of those in Thiruvayal (Mangalore taluk) required resurvey because areas were incorrect, boundaries had altered, or survey had been made incorrectly.

Mr.Priestley thought a resurvey would be necessary in Mangalore and Udipi, but probably not in Kundapur and Uppinangadi A class villages (letter No.C 512/B&C of '23 dated 29-8-23)

I have already reported in my letter R.O.C.No.477-R/F of 25 dated 18-8-25 that it is probably unnecessary in - Waluvanad and this opinion has been accepted. It is likely that I shall be able to give the same opinion as regards Palghat and in the A class villages of Kurumbranad.

IV

Endorsement thereon by the Collector of South Kanara, L.Dis. No.8611-25 dated the 17th November 1925:-

Submitted to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement, Madras.

2. I have already expressed my views regarding the quality of survey work in the Mangalore taluk while stating the difficulties experienced in the Revenue Administration of this taluk in my report D Dis.No. 3538-25 dated 24th May 1925 to the Board

Reference-

Reference.-

The report of the Director of Survey and the endorsement by the Collector of South Kanara are submitted to Government with reference to their memorandum No.3184 E-25-1 dated 28th September 1925. The views already expressed by the Collector of South Kanara on the quality of the survey work in the Mangalore taluk have been embodied in the Board's Reference to Government No.G 3574/25-4 dated 9th June 1925

2. The Board considers that the further report now submitted by the Director of Survey also justifies the conclusion previously arrived at, that a resurvey of the Mangalore taluk is necessary.

Assistant Secretary

To the Second Secretary to Government.

Resurvey of Mangalore
Reference from the Board of
Rev (R.R.&S) No. G 3676/25-2
dt 5-12-25

O.M. No. 3184 E/25-2 dt 16-12-25

Done to-day
16/12

The Govt are not prepared to
accept the present report as
sufficient having regard
to Mr. Couchman's opinion
dt 3.3.24 Communicated to the
Board of Rev in Rev o.o. No
608 E/24-3 dt 11-4-24. The Board
of Rev is requested to state
whether the Director of Survey &
the Collector of South Kanara
can supply concrete instances
~~to which~~ in support of the
general Conclusions to which they have
arrived, and whether the
present Commissioner of
Settlement is prepared to
express an opinion of the
subject based on his personal
knowledge and verification

Vol
6/12

To remind on. 16.2.26
Reminded 18.2.26

of the records on the gro

- the Boards of Rev

C.F. 31

Revenue / DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 4217 E

Received 24 DEC 1925 192 . Registered 24-12-1925.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT. REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Subject.

Resurvey (South Kanara)-Mangalore taluk.

ENCLOSURES.
No.
Spare copies.

Refce. No. G 3184/25-3

Station Madras *Dated the* 22nd December '25

From

Land Revenue and
The Board of Revenue ~~Revenue~~ Settlement, ~~etc.~~
~~Separate Revenue.~~

N.Macmichael Esq.,I.C.S.,
Commr. of Land Revenue and Settlement.

~~Resolution~~
Reference.

Read the following paper:-

Memorandum from Government, Revenue Department, No. 3184 E/25-2 dated the 16th December 1925.

pp 13-14 ante

Reference.-

The Board requests to be furnished with a copy of Mr.Couchman's opinion dated 3rd March 1924 referred to in the Government memorandum.

pp 18-21 of 3178/17 M-(S)

I & Vishwanatham
Assistant Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

M.D. 23-12

21 L
Rev. Dept

OM No. 3184 E/25 dt 5.1.26

Re survey-South Kanara-
Mangalore taluk-Bd's Refce
No Li. 3184/25-3 & 22.12.25

A copy of Mr. Couchma
opinion dated 3rd march
1924 is ~~furnished~~ forwarded to the
Board of Revenue.

21

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.** C.F. 81 23 L

CURRENT No. 1133 'E

Received 16 APR 1926 192 Registered 16·4 1926

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT. REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Subject.

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara - Mangalore taluk.

ENCLOSURES.
No.....
.....
Spare copies.....

Reference No. 106/26-2.

Station Madras *Dated the* 12th April 1926. 192

From

The Board of Revenue Land Revenue and Revenue Settlement, etc. ~~Separate Revenue.~~

~~Resolution~~ Reference. N.Macmichael, Esq., I.C.S., Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement.

Read the following:-

Letter from G.W.Wells, Esq., M.A., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara, D.Dis. No. 1540-26, dated 26th March 1926.

II.

Letter from F.P. Vincent Gompertz Esq., Director of Survey R.C.No. 32 R/F., dated 26-3-1926.

REFERENCE:

With reference to Government Memorandum No. 3184 E-25-2, dated 16-12-1925 the Board submits for the information of Government the reports of the Collector of South Kanara and the Director of Survey, with their enclosures, supplying concrete instances in

support of the general conclusions to which they have arrived regarding the quality of the survey work in the Mangalore taluk.

2. Government ask for a report on the quality of the survey work and the possibility of using it as a basis for future work irrespective of the fact that the survey was not on traverse basis. The Collector's report shows that difficulties are experienced in the Revenue administration and the report of the Director of Survey which gives instances of the defects in the record shows that such difficulties are bound to arise. Omission of measurements, errors in measurements, want of correspondence between the ground and the map and errors in areas have been noticed. Some of the differences in area are very striking e.g. S.No. 42 of 67 of Malavur; and in S.No. 8 of the same village the areas of as many as 33 out of 65 subdivisions had to be corrected. Bad records are a great handicap to efficient maintenance. As observed by Mr. Chadwick in his evidence before the Survey and Land Records Committee ~~the~~ "faults in Survey and Registration are more acutely felt by the least vocal point of the community; i.e., both the smaller ryot and the lower Government officer. Bad records waste the time more of the Revenue Inspector and village officer than they do of the Tahsildar who does not handle these records to the same extent. They lead to bad and perfunctory inspection and bad initial work is always costly both in time and money."

3. The Director of Survey proposes to resurvey the Mangalore taluk on the lines approved in G.O. No. 1354, Revenue, dated 6-9-1923, for the block map taluks of Hindupur and Madaksir of the Anantapur district. This will cheapen the cost of the survey though the average cost is expected to be higher than in the taluks of the Anantapur district.

4. The present Commissioner of Settlement has no personal

other duties as Labour Commissioner has it been possible for him to do any inspection of the survey. He is not therefore prepared to express an opinion based on his personal knowledge.

Ajibanhataraman
15/4/26

Ag. Assistant Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,

with comparative sketches and a tracing of the village plan.

S.S./12-4.

15/4

Copy of letter from G.A. Wells Esq., M.A., I.C.S., Collector of South Kanara, No. D.Dis. 1540-26, dated 26th March 1926:-

Survey - Resurvey - (South Kanara) - Mangalore taluk - Defects in the existing survey - Concrete instances. Report called. Board's Reference No.G.106/26-1, dated 19-1-1926.

Paragraph 1 (1) of my report D.Dis. 3538-25 dated 24-5-25 to the Board.reproduced in paragraph 5 (1) of Board's Reference No. G.3574/24-4, dated 9-6-1925 The defects noticed in the survey of the following villages of the Gurpur Firka of the Mangalore taluk are of the nature dealt with in this paragraph. Please see the list enclosed.

36 Muchur	113. Badaga Ulipadi
37 Kompadavu	14 Mogar
102 Addyar	77 Pachanady
103 Nirmarga	78 Kudupu
105 Arkula	68 Adyapadi
112 Tenka Ulipadi	69 Kolambe

pages 3-5 above

Paragraphs 1 (2) and (3) of the above report reproduced in paragraph 5 (2) and (3) of Board's Reference No.G. 3574/25-4 dated 9-6-1925. Fields of very large extents, each containing a large number of sub divisions having no independent plottable data exist, and it is difficult to effect further sub divisions as there are no data to fix the boundaries of the existing sub divisions, and as Bhustiti differs considerably from the map, in a list of a number of such fields with other particulars is enclosed. In the following cases, it was found necessary to resurvey the fields concerned and issue errata to the Settlement Registers before effecting further sub divisions in already existing settlement sub divisions.

19 Athikaribettu.

S. No. 85	Recorded area.	Revised area
	17.3	19.81

Difference 2.08 acres and Rs.2 in assessment increase.

S.No.87-1	14.78	16.65

Excess 1.87 acres in extent Rs.1-13-0 in assessment. The above 2 fields were resurveyed and errata sanctioned in Collector's D.Dis.1719 D. dated 22nd May 1916.

22 Kavathar.

S.No.81-2	4.59	6.78

crease of 2.19 acres in area and Rs.2-3-0 in ssessment. Errata sanctioned in Collector's .Dis. 1719 D. dated 22nd May 1916.

16 Talipadi.	Area.	ub divisions.	
S.Nos. 65	9.48	15	Resurveyed
" 66	4.80	24	and errata issued for

change of shape of sub divisions and difference in area of the several sub divisions - Vide Collector's Dis. 121 D dated 15-1-1918.

168	11.44	24	Do. Vide
176	4.58	6	Collector's Dis.No.1033 D dated 10-2-1924

21 Elathur.

S.No. 28	Recorded area.	Area as per errata.	
	15.21	13.98	Resurveyed
" 30	6.17	6.60	and errata issued in Collector's

D.Dis.2563-E4, dated 18th May 1921. Extent decreased by 1.23 acres and assessment by 14 annas.

" 12	22.41	23.68	Increase of 1.27 acres

extent and 15 annas in assessment as per errata issued Collector's Dis. 4910-23-E4 dated 18-10-1923.

25 Inna.	Recorded area.	Revised area.	
S.Nos. 151	2.46	2.66	Resurveyed by
154	4.80	2.40	the Deputy Surveyor at

the instance of the Land Records Tahsildar. Extent decreased by 2.20 acres and assessment by 8 annas. Errata sanctioned in Collector's Dis. No.2670-D. dated 16th September 1917. Rev. 17

" 143	66.55	73.07	Extent increased by

6.52 acres and assessment by 4-14-0 after resurvey. Errata issued as per Collector's Dis. 2549-D, dated 19th August 1918.

	Recorded area.	Revised area.	
67 Malavur.			
S.No. 42	85.54	59.97	Difference is 25.57 acres in area and Rs.19-13-0 in assessment. Errata sanctioned in Collector's Dis. No.7471-D-23 dated 1st May 1924.
S.No. 8	Area 106.99 acres. Contains 65 sub divisions. Area of 33 sub divisions changed and errata sanctioned in Collector's Dis. 4977-23, dated 3rd May 1924.		
67 Malavur.			
S.No.63	62.21	70.97	Difference 8.76 acres in area and Rs.8-11-0 in assessment, increase. Resurveyed and errata sanctioned in Collector's Dis.11645-24D dated 4-12-1924.
71 Mallur.			
S.No. 25.	Area 110.31 acres. Contains 85 sub divisions. Resurveyed owing to change of shape and difference in area of the sub divisions and errata sanctioned in Collector's D.Dis. 1362-25, dated 6-4-1925.		
99 Amblamogar.			
S. No. 7.	68.02	62.50	Difference 5.52 acres. Resurveyed and ~~errat~~ errata sanctioned in Collector's D.Dis. 5376-24 dated 23rd May 1924.

123 Kuriyala.	Recorded area.	Revised area.	Difference.
S.No. 46	6.35	10.98	4.63
" 47	3.40	4.48	1.08
" 50	24.65	20.60	4.05

Resurveyed and errata approved in Collector's Dis. No.6041-25 dated 9th August 1925.

126 Thumbe.			
S.No. 57	43.47	46.07	2.60

Resurveyed and errata issued as per Collector's Dis. No.6041-24 dated 23-12-1924.

60 Harakada.			
S.No.25/9	35.18	31.94	3.24
76 Padushedde.			
S.No. 14/1	24.41	19.55	4.86
" 15	19.41	27.97	8.56
67 Malavar.			
S.No. 78	42.01	40.61	1.40

Village boundary of the 3 villages effected. Resurveyed and errata issued vide Collector's Dis. No. 7036-25 D dated 18th September 1925.

122 Badagabellur.

(1) 7, 8 and 9 - Settlement sub divisions - in S. No. 2 measuring 6.09 acres were re-numbered as S.No. 88/1, 2, 3 respectively. During investigation on the ground it is found that the shape of the sub divisions materially changes according to the Bhustiti.

(2) Settlement sub-divisions 7, 8 and 9 in S.K. No. 17 were re-numbered as Nos. 94/1 and 2 and 95 respectively. When a darkhast plot had to be measured in the vicinity it was found out that the mapping of the above fields was wrong. While correcting the shape according to Bhustiti it was found that the adjoining fields in Tenkabellur village S. Nos. 92, 83 and 117 are also affected.

96. Munnur	Recorded area.	Revised area.
S. No. 39	20.20	19.10

Difference 1.10 acres. Errata sanctioned as per Collector's Dis. No. 5556-D/21-E4, dated 3-10-1921.

ist showing the Survey defects which exist in the several villages of Gurpur Firka

South Kanara District

Number and name of village	cases in which there is difficulty of relaying the original offsets from the sides of long triangles into which the blocks have been divided at the original survey.	Survey numbers in which measurements have been omitted from the ferro prints.	S. Nos in which a large number of measurements are incorrect.	number of fields at the time of the Settlement.	number of fields that have no plottable data.	Remarks.
1	2					
36 Muchur	S. nos. 4, 42, 47, 54, 55	—	S. nos 4, 42 — 8.			
37 ompadavu	S. nos. 12, 34, 48, 50 & 59	—	Nos 4, 6, 60, 66, 68 &			
102 -lyar	S. nos. 1647	S. Nos 11 & 12				
103 Nirmarga	Nos. 1 to 120		S. nos. 1. 2. 4. 8. 11. 12. 20 {28 33. 34. 35. 40. 4 46. 47. 48. 55. 56. 5 76. 81. 82. 83. 84. 8			

Arkula	S. no. 16 44	1 – 32. 43	22. 26	44	74
112					
Tenkallipadi	S. no. 6. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 37 & 38		5. 10. 32	42	39
113					
Badagallipadi	1. 5. 6. 3. 4. 7. 8. 18. 21. 32. 34 37. 38. 39. 40. 43. 44 & 48. 50		46. 76. 85	105	101
114					
Kogar	9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 16. 23. 24 27. 28.		—	51	48
77.					
Pachanady	1, 3. 22. 28. 29. 30. 57. 64. 65. 69		17. 19. 31. 35. 36. 62	6	69
78					
Kudupa	1, 2. 3. 7. 8. 40. 41. 42. 43. 45. 48. 49 51. 53. 32.		8. 9. 45. 30. 49	56	56
68					
Adyapady	2. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 55. 66		—	2	68
69					
Kolambe	1 & 20, 75 & 78, 80 & 93.		—		93

List of sub-divisions having no independent plottable data.

lage.	S.No.	Extent.	No. of Sub-divisions.
16. Talipadi.	77	40.50.	30
	63	19.31	40
19 Athikaribettu.	81	45.90	39
21 Elathur.	36	27.85	57
22 Kavathar.	11	84.40	42
67 Malavur	8	106.99	65
	93	19.18	90
71 Mulur.	33	51.76	42
		110.31	85
25 Inna.	106	57.65	45
	117	53.93	22
	155	60.50	42
122 Badaga-Bellur.	42	110.28	34
	36	66.23	40
123. Kuriala.	18	56.41	46
	23	62.10	47
127.Muda.	124	43.08	25
	50	13.84	53
125 Kallige.	2	43.06	44
	11	46.77	42
	13	58.06	39
	39	51.61	35
126 Thumbe.	42	41.39	24
27 Mundkur.	96	41.88	25
	191	43.63	13
40 Muduperar.	102	102.26	229
48 Chellairu.	5	130.62	133
96 Konaje.	46	72.66	58
102 Addyar.	42	24.74	23
	43	49.28	35
	45	60.79	32
105 Arkula.	13	60.58	42
	23	108.45	22
109 Mallur.	2	209.66	160
114 Mogaru.	10	52.92	36
	16	44.43	44
115 Muthur.	10	121.60	38
128 Amtadi.	16	83.50	37
	26	49.87	37
	18	36.39	33
	67	39.63	33

Letter from F.P.Vincent Gompertz Esquire, Director of Survey R.C.No. 32 R/F dated 26-3-1926.

*****

Please see Board's reference No. G 106/26-1, dated the 19th January 1926.

The general conclusions which were drawn by the Collector of South Kanara and myself were

(1) the measurement and plotting of new subdivisions more often than not necessitated the resurvey of the whole field and of the ~~fixed~~ fields adjoining it;

(2) missing marks could generally not be replaced correct firstly because it was difficutl to relay the original offsets from the sides of the long triangles, secondly because many measurements had been omitted from the record of measurement and lastly because most of the fields have not been supplied with independent plottable data. Another reason can be added viz., because boundaries of fields have altered considerably since the last survey.

I have been requested to supply concrete instances in support of these conclusions.

2. Plans comparing the two surveys have been prepared for a few fields in each of the two villages resurveyed and are submitted herewith as concrete instances in support of the first conclusion. They also support the second. The plans show that in some holdings the boundaries have altered, and that, even where they have not, the block survey plans often do not show the real dimensions of the holdings sothat the width and length of ~~x~~ such fields differ considerably from that shown in the block survey plan. When the variation is considerable new subdivisions would protrude outside the block map field plan or would not fill the space provided in the plan.

To remedy this the field would have to be remeasured and this should necessitate correcting the fields adjoining. To the faulty block map field plans are partly due to the two independent records of measurement for the same

fields noticed by Mr.Priestly in Udipi. I saw some in Karakal while inspecting with the present Commissioner and Mr. Couchman. Supplemental subdivisions were made by the Settlement officer ~~and also~~ after the survey party had left the district and the surveyor sent to measure these were unable to do so without resurveying the fields but were apparently not made to pursue errors or to cancel the superseded block maps & field plans. Resurvey for this re was much more extensive in parts of Malabar during Janma registration and a very large number of fields in Palgha talukas were remeasured and fresh plans prepared for this reason. There is thus no lack of concrete instances.

It will be seen from the plans that there are varia in the shapes of fields even when there is little diffe in the ~~preimeter~~ perimeter measurements. There are few field plans in either of the two villages where these discrepancies do not occur because errors in a relatively small percenta of many ~~lng~~ long lines that were measured in each block map wou start the whole skeleton and produce incorrect field plans more especially because all the bends of a field were sele offsetted from the same long line.

3. The tracing of a part of village map enclosed show instances of the difficulty in relaying the long G lines. 64 points 45 were not demarcated and lie mostly in the mid fields. The lines could be relaid by computing and aligning perpendicula provided the measurements recorded were quite correct but the proceds is tedious and probably beyond the capacity of most shanbogues while a small error would increase progressively in the alignment. The country was not open even 30 years ago and many of the lines were aligned by sound so that this method of relaying the long lines and using the offsets must be dismissed as not practical.

It was explained in my letter dated 13th May 1925 quoted in para 3 of Board's reference No. G 3574-24-4 dated the 9th of June 1925 how unreliable are the figures of measurement

The karnam has therefore to resort to the perimete measurements in the field measurement book and these are insufficient.

4. I have explained in para 2 above, and the plans enclosed make it clearer, why the measurement of new subdivisions must so often demand the resurvey of the field and its surrounding ~~xx~~ fields, but wish to make it clear also that there are innumerable concrete instances already in the ferro printed field plans of the district of supplemental subdivision necessitating resurvey. The greatest number is to be found in Palghat of Malabar, surveyed on a similar method, where it was otherwise impossible to plot the subdivisons needed for Janmam Registration.

A revision of the adangals in South Kanara cannot therefore be done without a resurvey of the fields containing subdivisions and those not dealt with would have to be resurveyed by the shanbogues when subdivisions are sanctioned.

4. I submit respectfully that it is in the interests of the yot that any survey of his property should be reasonably correct nd provide a record, making transfer of land cheap and easy, nd a means of relaying correctly any boundary in dispute.

The existing survey in Mangalore taluk fulfils none of nese conditions nor can the survey be maintained. I have ent a copy of this letter to the Collector and to ~~xxx~~ the pecial Settlement Officer, Trichinopoly.

2. In this connection I may point out that while I think the decision to resurvey Kasaragod was on the whole sound because of the special badness of the survey in that taluk, it seems to me that the resurvey of Mangalore Taluk was undertaken on no intellegible grounds whatsover. Mr. Gompertz is obviously not a qualified adviser on a question purely of revenue administration. He did not even deign to explain in his report in G.O.No.1239 dated 11-8-24 what standard be adopted as the measure of accuracy.

I think the Board should be at once told that, while the work sanctioned and now to be sanctic in Kasaragod taluk should be pushed on, the Governmer are not satisfied that there are any good grounds for the resurvey of Mangalore taluk and that no further work for the purpose of resurvey there should be done till further orders but a report submitted showing what exactly has been done to date and what the standards are on which the Director of Survey based his report in G.C.No. 1239, dated 11-8-1924. Was the Collector consulted as to whether difficulties had been experienced in the revenue administration becaus of any inaccuracy or incompleteness of the survey record? If not then should be done now and if the reply is in the affirmative details should be given. The matter should be treated as urgent and no delay allowed to occur in the submission of reply

N.E.M.
20-4-25.

x x x

Issued as C.M. No.962 E/25-1, dated 22-4-1925.

C.No.2065 E/25. From the Board of Revenue, Land Rever and Settlement, No.G.3574/24-4, dated 9-6-1925.

To Under Secretary.

With reference to portion marked "C" of

note at p/ above the Board of Rev. reports that no further work has been done in the Mangalore taluk after the issue of G.O.No.1239 Mis., dated 11-8-1924.

2. With reference to portion marked "B" of C_2's note at p./ above the Board has now consulted the Collector of South Kanara; and it has also consulted again the Director of Survey. The defects in the existing survey of the Mangalore taluk pointed out by the Director of Survey are enumerated in paras 2-3 of Board's Reference (at pp.9-10 C.F.) and the difficulties in the Revenue administration of the taluk experienced by the Collector are detailed in para 5 at pp.(10-11) of C.F. Both the Director of Survey and the Collector consider that a re-survey is an administrative necessit and the Board agrees with them - para 6 page(11) C.F. In the circumstances stated it is for orders whether the Board may now be asked to proceed with the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk.

~~3. The further report regarding the estimate of the cost of survey of the Kumeri villages referred to in para 7 at p.11 C.F. may be awaited.~~

P.K.
22-6-25.
S.K.
24-6-25.

Kindly see paras 2 and 3 of H.M's note on pp.5 and 6 ante and the Board's Reference at pp.(8 to 11) c.f.

It is for orders whether the Board may be asked to proceed with the resurvey of Mangalore taluk.

V.R.
25-6-25.

Instructions how to deal with block map areas were prepared and issued years ago I think as B.S.O. 34 B. These instructions laid down how errors were to be investigated and in what circumstances the inference that the block was inaccurate as a whole not justified. Were these

instructions ever cancelled? Please put them up.

N.E.M.
25-6-25.

~~S.No.2272 B/25. From the Board of Revenue, L.R. & S. No.G.3574-24-5, dated 30-6-1925.~~

To Under Secretary.

B.S.O. No.34 B has not been cancelled. It has been ascertained from the Board's Office that the S.O. is under revision in that office. In the draft instructions issued by the Board of Revenue for the guidance of the special Tahsildars for District maintenance the Board of Revenue has directed that until the Standing Order (34 B) is revised the instructions contained in it should be followed so far as the present changed conditions of maintenance would permit. The draft of new B.S.O. No.34 B was first approved in G.O.No.3196 Revenue, dated 27-10-1911 a copy of the G.O. is also put up. It may be observed that at the conference it has been decided that the question of resurvey of all taluks in South Kanara except old Kasaragod should be further examined.

2. Para 1 of O.M. at page 5 C.F. para 7 of Board's Reference at p.11 C.F. and para 3 of note at page 8 supra. The total approximate cost of the Kumeri villages is now approximately estimated at Rs.58,200. The Board's suggestion to have an experimental survey of three kumeri villages may in the circumstances explained by the Board of Revenue be approved. For orders.

P.K.
1-7-25.
S.K.
3-7-25.

With reference to H.M's note on p. 2-3 ante it is submitted that B.S.O. No.34 B is still in force. The G.O. in which it was approved is in flag (B); and the G.O. in which the limits of measurement error were laid down is in flag ~~(B)~~ (C).

After discussing the question under what circumstances resurvey should be ordered with Messrs. Moore and Ragnavaiah H.M. ordered that the question whether a resurvey is necessary in the case of the Mangalore taluk should be further investigated: the test being whether the frame work of the existing survey. irrespective of the nature of the survey made and errors in the boundaries and areas of holdings. is sound. A Memo to this effect is under issue to the Board.

The points for orders now ar

(1) whether the experimental survey of three kumeri villages should be conduted before taking up the question of ordering a cadestral survey of the kumeri villages of Kasaragod taluk; and

(2) whether village maps should be published on the scale 8" to a mile?.

As regards the first point Government asked the Board to report on the extent of cultivation and cost of survey of kumeri villages. The Board's reply is at pp.12 and 13 c.f.

As regards the scale on which the village maps should be published the Board's recommendation to publish them on the scale 8" to a mile may be accepted for the reasons stated in para 5 of its reference at p.4 c.f

V.R.
8-7-25.

[C No 2476E/25] From the Board of Revenue
N his 1562 dy 20-7-1925.

Survey - (South Kanara) - Kasaragod taluk - Kumeri villages - Experiment.

To Under Secy

The report referred to in para 2 of the B.P. may be awaited. The Board will be reminded on 15-9-1925

2 Para 3 of the B.P regarding the re-survey of the Mangalore taluk.

Attention is invited to the memorandum (A) and also H.S.'s note at page 23 of Eo 1082 dy 15-7-25 of discussion at page 4 of (A). H.M. Considered that the re-survey of the old Kasaragod taluk of the South Kanara district may be continued and completed and ordered that the Board should examine whether re-survey is necessary in the case of all the other taluks of South Kanara based on a different test as the grounds of the framework of Survey. In C.M. No 1504E/25-3 dy 10-7-1925 the Board was informed accordingly. ~~To~~ No It is submitted for orders whether the Board of Rev may Order have issued be informed that the Govt await the report of the Board in O.M. 27-7-25 of the Board of Rev on the general question para 4 of the 3 of (D) of the necessity for the resurvey of all taluks O.O. at p 7 of (A) of the South Kanara Dt except the old Kasaragod taluk before orders are passed

pages 3-4 of Eo 1711 dy 4-11-25 (D)

Since read the same in the B.P. in the connection with the Order.

re passed on the necessity for the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk. - After

SK
29/7/25

pages 2-5 CF

From the Board's Resolution in the c.f. it appears that the Board is awaiting the orders of Government on its letter at pages 9-10 of Fl (9) which deals with the resurvey of Mangalore Taluk. The file Fl.(9) was closed on the note of U.S. (pp.23-24) in which it is stated that at the discussion between Messrs. Moore and Raghaviah and H.M. further investigation should be made of the question whether resurvey of the Mangalore taluk was necessary. It is not clear from that note whether H.M. had before him and had considered the specific report put in by the Board at pages 9-10 of the same file or whether the information he requires is something beyond that report.

page 6 CF

(A) How can I work in this face of memo No 15021 E/25-8 10 July 1925 I cannot understand. (D) in Ro

Copy at p4 above

The file relates to the resurvey of Kumaramane in Kasaragod. My file relates to the resurvey of the Udupi taluk. Should have been dealt with there by the Secretary as it, the Secretary can alone tell

pages 2-5 CF

In that report it is urged that survey was not on the traverse basis; villages were measured in blocks of 160 acres and were divided into long triangles Stones at the corners of these triangles cannot be replaced correctly when missing and the country is so thickly planted that the offsets cannot always be measured. If H.M. wants further informatio a specific call will be made to the Board for it. But this information seems to make it clear that resurvey is necessary on the test stated at page 7 of Fl. (D), para.4, viz., whether the frame work of the existing survey is sound.

[illegible] on the traverse basis which [illegible]
were meanwhile in Boscrea blocks [illegible]
were decided into [illegible] triangles (which
[illegible] were not [illegible] way). If these considerations
were [illegible], it would surely mean
that all areas surveyed on the block
or [illegible] system should need
[illegible] respecting [illegible] quality of the work.
The strictly planning of the survey with
check by replacement of stones made
[illegible] system of surveying has no
system that will make him to be done
without [illegible] effort

Thus much seems, comes
like to [illegible] if the B.P. at pp(6-6 to) of
[illegible] 1082) 15-7-25 was ever submitted
for orders or too [illegible]? It is [illegible] into
a [illegible] which has [illegible] to do [illegible]. It
[illegible] relates to the surveying of [illegible]
areas. The [illegible] B.P. letter is taken out
of [illegible] for disposal with [illegible]
papers: of that nature.

9.9.6.25

JRC
19.7

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Shall we [illegible] to allow [illegible] would
B.P. that [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

47

Yes please what Wyatt: put his
case as in the first draft my letter of 12/5
does not it was understood as his wish
& the experiment that the Bosses refuse
further what may be no orders were
handed to the B.P.

pages 1-2 of CM to the Board of Rev (L R & S) No 31-4-25 dt. -1-25

pages 1-2 of CM No. 40348/25 from the Board of Rev (L R & S) Ref F 3676-2-25 dt 5-12-25

To Under Secretary

Please see the CM to the Board of Rev (L R & S) and its reply thereto on pages 7-12 CF. The Director of Survey has reported on the quality of the Survey of the Mangalore taluk. He considers that the survey will not be reliable maintenance by ordinary shanbogues and will not enable making of sub divisions and that a re Survey is necessary. The Collector and the Board of Rev agree with the Director of Survey. For orders whether the recommendation may be accepted

SM
11/1/26

S.

Cr

14/1/26

Mr Empey is not a safe guide in such a matter and Mr Inch is scarcely competent. Having regard to the Chairman's minute I cant accept his present reports as sufficient. Please ask if the Director of Survey & the Collector can supply complete

instance a report of the general conclusions to which they have arrived whether the present commencement of settlement is premature to enable an opinion of the subject based on personal knowledge & verification of the facts on the ground

HBL
14/12

To Undersecretary -

A draft O.M. to the ~~Local Official~~ Board of Revenue ~~& the Settlement Commr~~ is submitted for approval

SN
15/12/28

Issued as our No. 3184 E/25-2 of 16.12.25
[CNo. 4217 E/25] from the Bd of Rev & R&S.
Refce. G.3184/25-3 of 22.12.25

Tours

Sent a duly copy of his conclusions
Opinion of 3.3.25 asked for by the Bd
may be forwarded to it

a draft O.M. is submitted for approval in draft

DSD 15/12

4.1.26.

Central Survey Office,
CHEPAUK,

Madras, 15th April 1926.

Rev. 6-1 E
19-4-26

My dear Hall

I should like to discuss with you the subject of the resurvey of Mangalore taluq S. Canara before you send the file to H.Q.

The Board's report has only just been sent so perhaps it will not inconvenience you to delay the file till I arrive in Coty about the end of the month?

Yours sincerely

Ref? St. Vincent-Compeuh's
by A.L.

To Under Secretary

The file relates to the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk South Kanara Dt.

(M) 2. A brief note on the Survey of South Kanara Dt is given at pages 13 to 19 of G.O. 195 Rev Dt 1-2-23 The whole of the South Kanara distri

page 56 of the Survey Committee report Vol I was Surveyed on the block map and Plane table System in the years 1893-18

page [illegible] of G.O. [illegible] The Survey Committee was of opinion the whole district might probably re

page 1-7 of G.O. 1776 resurvey. In 1919, the Board of Rev repo

(K) that the resurvey of the Kasaragod tal would ~~be~~ in any case be necessary, tha Hoppinangadi taluk would ~~have to be~~ require a resurvey and that as rega the remaining taluks, the necessity f the resurvey would be decided after investigation by a Special Settleme officer or by a Special officers. The papers were recorded in G.O

(K) No. 1776 Dt 29-7-19.

G.O 105 1/2/23 (M) 3. In 1923 the Govt Considered that with reference to the whole of the South Kanara Dt. an examination whether an resurvey was is ~~were~~ necessary both in the interests of the administration and of the ryot should be made before any portion of the Survey of the district was begun and they accordingly entrusted the Mr. Priestley with the

enquiry Mr. Poiestley's report is at pages 5-12 of Go. No 1796 dt 7-12-23. After Consideration of the ~~Scheme the Govt directed~~ report and of Mr. Couchmans opinion that the present survey is a sufficient basis for revenue Collections the Govt. ~~decided~~ considered in their order No. 1796 dt 7-12-23 that the decision (W) on the question of the resurvey of the South Kanara district should be postponed pending receipt of the report of the Director of Survey on the results of the experimental survey (of certain typical villages) ~~After~~ the results of the experimental survey of the villages in the Kasaragod taluk ~~were~~ were received and they showed that the block survey of the taluk was not at all maintainable and after detailed examination of the question the Govt sanctioned the resurvey of the Coast villages of the Kasaragod taluk in Go. No. 987 Rev dt 1-7-24. (S)

para 10 page 8 of Go 1958 dt 1-2

4- As regards Mangalore the experimental Survey was Conducted in two villages Bondanthila and Thiruvayil and it showed that in former 904 out of 1134 holdings and in the latter 629 out of 810 required resurvey either because the areas were incorrect or boundaries had

page 1 of Go 1239 dt 11-8-24

had altered since the initial Survey or because Survey had been made incorrectly. The percentage of missing stones was respectively 5.4 and 10.75 and of other stones found necessary 24.3 and 29.6 &c. The ~~Govt have acco~~ Board recommended the resurvey of the mangalore taluk and the Govt have sanctioned it in their order No. 1239 Rev dy. 11.8.24

5 In connection with the Survey of the Kumeri villages of the Kasaragod taluk the Hon C₂ raised the question of the necessity for the resurvey of the mangalore taluk and directed that pending further examination of the question, all further work on the resurvey of the mangalore taluk should be stopped. The Board of Rev was informed accordingly and it was requested to re examine the necessity of the resurvey. The Board's report was received and it will be found at pages 3-6. C/F In para 3 of that report the Director enumerated the defects in the existing Survey. The chief defects are that the existing Survey is ~~not~~ difficult of maintenance by ordinary Shanbogues and that the making of subdivisions was not possible.

The Collector (Mr. Wells) and the Director of Survey recommended that Mangalore taluk should be resurveyed and the Board agreed with them. This recommendation was not accepted and the Board of Rev was requested to report on the quality of the Survey in the taluk and the possibility of using it as a basis for a future work irrespective of the fact ~~whether~~ that the Survey is not on a traverse basis. The Board's further report is at pages 11-14 C.F. It still adhere to its previous opinion (Hon C2's note pages 6-7 above) pages 9-10 C.F.

b. In memo No. 3187 E/25-2 dt 16.12.25 the Board was requested to state whether the Director of Survey and the Collector of South Kanara can supply concrete materials in support of the general conclusions ~~as to~~ whether the present Commr is prepared to express an opinion as to which they have arrived. Vide Hon C2's orders pages 9-10 above. The present ~~Board~~ reference dt 12-4-26 is a reply to the memo. The Director of Survey and the Collector have reported the defects in the existing Survey: they still think that a resurvey is necessary ~~The Board of Rev Attention is in this~~ The Board's report that the present Settlement Commr has no time to make a personal

inspection of the Survey and that he is not prepared to offer an opinion based on his personal knowledge

I Attention is in this Connection solicited to the Supplemental question asked by Mr. Lalkhana at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 13.2.26. and the answer given thereto by the Hon'ble on behalf of Govt they are extracted below for easy reference

portion B at page 16 of Lodged 41026 (N) 25

Q If Govt are going to make resurvey ~~in Car~~ in ~~Cannanore~~ Mangalore and Cannanore taluks then they will locate a Survey office in Mangalore

A I think Sir it will not be necessary to make resurvey of these Taluks

The other L.C. questions relating to the resurvey and resettlement of the South Kanara Dt. are put up placed separately tied in the bottom of the file. No undertaking on behalf of Govt has been given regarding the resurvey of the taluks in the South Kanara Dt. in those Cases. Forwarded.

S.V. 29/4/26

Please see also the D.O. from Mr. Comperty at page 11 above.

The Govt are not prepared to consider further the question of resurveying the Mangalore Taluk or any other taluks of South Kanara Dt. (Govt Mr. Rasappa's D.O. Tally

The resurvey of Mangalore taluk seems unnecessary

30/4 S. 4.5.26

Work is already being commenced until
the Commencement of Revised Survey is in operation
to express an opinion on his subject based on
~~his~~ personal knowledge.

Draft

Rec
5/5/26

5.5.26.

To Under Secy

A draft order is submitted

It does not appear necessary to enter
~~the~~ It may be left to the Board of Rev to come up to Govt
the Govt. in the Call reminder book. Off on ... with proposals for a resurvey
personal knowledge the Commissioner
a
considers ~~a~~ that ~~the~~ re-survey of the
and the other taluks of South Kanara except Kasaragod
Mangalore taluk is necessary. He
will come up to Govt with proposals for the re-survey.

Agreed. Issue a class to file

Rec.
5/5/26

Sec
5/5/26

6/5

Madras. 11-10 (a)—Mo. 105—9-2-20. (S.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. ....., dated 192

" " " " ..... " 192

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1133 E/24 From the Board of Rev (LRS) No. G 106/26-2, dated 12-4- 1926

" " " " ..... " ..... " 192

" " ..... " ..... " 192

ORDER. No. 727, dated 7-5-1926

Mis.

C/o - Rocker

6/5

7.5

The Government are not prepared to consider further the question of re-surveying the Mangalore taluk or any other taluk of South Kanara district (except the Kasaragod taluk which is already being surveyed) until the Commissioner of Land Revenue, Survey and Settlement is in a position to express an opinion on the subject based on personal knowledge

7 MAY 1926
RS

To the Board of Rev (LRS)

6/5.

P.M.
5/5/26 Sec.
6/5/26.